REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-18 are currently pending. In light of the amendments and following remarks, Applicant believes all claims are in condition for allowance.

The Drawings

The drawings were rejected as being informal. Applicant submits herewith formal drawings so the rejection is overcome.

The § 102(e) Rejection of Claim 1-18

Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,208,345, issued March 27, 2001 to Sheard et al. (hereinafter "Sheard"). Accordingly, it is asserted that Sheard discloses all the features of the pending claims. For the following reasons, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The Office Action states that Applicant asserted that Sheard does not disclose a GUI. This is incorrect. Applicant stated that Sheard does not disclose a GUI as claimed. Applicant acknowledges that Sheard discloses a GUI, such as the one shown in FIG. 18. However, the components that are shown connected in the GUI are telecommunication hardware and software elements, such as information stores, processors, input/output devices and the like (see abstract).

As Sheard describes, the connections between components in their GUI include adapters that reformulate technology-specific data to technology-independent data (col. 8, lines 22-24). Dissimilar applications can be those applications that differ in terms of technology, operation, supporting platforms and operating systems, data, input/output interfaces, communications protocols, and the like (see, e.g., col. 6, lines 53-57).

Referring to FIG. 17, a palette 530 is shown that includes various adapter (see, e.g., col. 19, lines 31-39). Some of these adapters can be seen utilized in FIG. 18 (specified on the arrows). Thus, the GUI in Sheard shows connections between components and adapters, the components being software applications, hardware devices and the like.

Sheard does not describe a GUI that allows linking Business Classes and storing these relationships as claimed. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify "Business Classes" as is described in the specification (see, e.g., page 12, lines 20-31). Thus, it is now clear that the claimed Business Classes do not read up on the components or adapters shown in the GUI of FIG. 18 of Sheard.

The Office Action stated that Sheard discusses classes and instantiations of classes (citing col. 26, line 49 to col. 27, lines 23 and col. 29, line 12 to col. 30, line 67). A closer review of this section reveals that Sheard discusses that the charting application can be implemented as a JAVA class (col. 26, lines 49 et seq.). This charting application can be run when a user double clicks on an adapter (col. 26, line 39-48). Thus, Sheard shows that the adapters can be activated to run programs and those programs can be generated with object-oriented programming languages. This does not show that Business Classes are linked in a GUI as claimed.

Additionally, the Office Action cited the meta definitions of Sheard as evidencing relationships (citing col. 31, line 24 to col. 34, line 4). Each adapter has meta definitions corresponding to the specific functionality of the adapter (col. 31, lines 24-26). When two adapters are connected, the system compares these meta models to determine if the models can communicate without a special mapping (col. 31, lines 51-57).

Shread then discloses that the special mapping of meta definitions can be performed by linking definitions in a GUI (see, e.g., col. 31, lines 58 et seq.). However, the meta definitions are not Business Classes as recited in the claims. Thus, contrary to what is asserted, the claims do not read upon performing a mapping of meta definitions described in Sheard.

Applicant acknowledges that Shread discloses various GUIs, however, a prima facie case of anticipation requires, at a minimum, that the claims read upon these GUIs shown in Sheard. As has been shown above, the claims do not read upon the GUIs in Sheard so the reference does not support a prima case of anticipation.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant believes all the pending claims are in condition for allowance and should be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would in any way expedite the prosecution of the application, please do not hesitate to call the undersigned at (408) 446-8693.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Ritter
Reg. No. 36,653

RITTER, LANG & KAPLAN LLP
12930 Saratoga Ave., Suite D1
Saratoga, CA 95070
Tel: 408-446-8690
Fax: 408-446-8691